UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,560	07/29/2003	Karsten Schulz	13909-132001 / 2003P00484	4776

32864 7590 02/22/2007		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/628,560	SCHULZ, KARSTEN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isaac T. Tecklu	2192	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 July 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/18/05</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the application filed on 07/09/2003.

2.   Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

3.   The office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed on 07/09/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1-7 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US

6,920,456 B2).

Per claim 1, Lee discloses a workflow model comprising (e.g. FIG. 1, Workflow Model

24 and related text):

a workflow (e.g. FIG. 3, element 406 and related text), the workflow including actual

tasks (e.g. FIG. 3, element 414 and related text);

a workflow view representing an abstraction of the workflow (e.g. FIG. 9, element 500

and related text), the workflow view including virtual tasks (e.g. FIG. 9, element 502a-502d and

related text); and

an aggregate workflow compiled from the workflow and the workflow view (col. 8: 1-10

"... aggregate of the workflow from ... ") and operable to support execution of the workflow

and the workflow view (col. 3:62-68 "... execution of processes ... executes any programs associated with ... workflow ...") within a workflow engine (e.g. FIG. 1, element 2 Workflow Engine and related text).

Per claim 2, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 1 wherein the workflow view includes a routing task for interacting with a collaborating workflow view (col. 1:45-55 "... workflow program route ...").

Per claim 3, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 2 wherein the aggregate workflow includes a plurality of aggregation routing task pairs (col. 2: 45-50 workflow files and an action list ..."), each of the aggregation routing task pairs bounding a virtual task and an associated actual task (col. 2:45-55 "... list of actions capable of being performed at the nodes defined within one workflow file in workflow file table ..."), where the aggregation routing task pairs are in series with one another and with the routing task (e.g. FIG. 3, element 408 and related text).

Per claim 4, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 2 wherein the aggregate workflow includes a first aggregation routing task (e.g. FIG. 3, element 414 and related text) and a second aggregation routing task (e.g. FIG. 3, element 412 and related text).

Per claim 5, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 4 wherein the routing task is connected in series with the first aggregation routing task (e.g. FIG. 3 and related text).

Per claim 6, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 4 wherein the first aggregation routing task is linked by an outgoing dependency to a first virtual task and a first actual task that is associated with the first virtual task (col. 12:5-15 "... actions associated with the work item ...").

Per claim 7, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 4 wherein the second aggregation routing task is linked by an incoming dependency from a first virtual task and a last actual task that is associated with the first virtual task (e.g. FIG. 3 and related text).

Per claim 9, Lee discloses the workflow model of claim 1 wherein the aggregate workflow includes state transition dependencies between the actual tasks and the virtual tasks (col. 12:5-15 "... actions associated with the work item ...").

Per claim 10, Lee discloses a method comprising: compiling a workflow view that includes view tasks and a workflow that includes tasks, each view task corresponding to at least one task, into an aggregate workflow; and executing the aggregate workflow (col. 3:62-68 "... execution of processes ... executes any programs associated with ... workflow ...").

Per claim 11, Lee discloses the method of claim 10 wherein compiling the workflow view and the workflow comprises inserting a plurality of aggregation routing task pairs into the aggregate workflow, each pair bounding a view task and an associated task (col. 10:1-10 "... add a work list ...").

Per claim 12, Lee discloses the method of claim 11 wherein inserting the plurality of aggregation routing task pairs comprises arranging the aggregation routing task pairs in series (col. 8: 1-10 "... aggregate of the workflow from ... ") with one another and with a routing task included within the workflow view for the purpose of executing the workflow view in conjunction with a second workflow view, the second workflow view associated with a second workflow (col. 3:62-68 "... execution of processes ... executes any programs associated with ... workflow ...").

Per claim 13, Lee discloses the method of claim 10 wherein compiling the workflow view and the workflow comprises: linking a first aggregation routing task to an input of a first view task (col. 8: 1-10 "... aggregate of the workflow from ... "); linking a second aggregation routing task to an output of the first view task; and linking a first task between the first

aggregation routing task and the second aggregation routing task, for parallel execution with the first view task (e.g. FIG. 10 and related text).

Per claim 14, Lee discloses the method of claim 13 wherein linking the first task comprises: linking the first aggregation routing task to an input of the first task; and linking an output of a second task to the second aggregation routing task (e.g. FIG. 10 and related text).

Per claim 15, Lee discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising linking the second aggregation routing task to a routing task included within the workflow view, wherein the routing task is in communication with a secondary workflow view associated with a secondary workflow (col. 3:62-68 "... execution of processes ... executes any programs associated with ... workflow ...").

Per claim 16, this is the system version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 1), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Du.

Per claim 17, Lee discloses the system of claim 16 further comprising a workflow engine operable to enact the aggregated workflow (e.g. FIG. 1, element 2 Workflow Engine and related text).

Per claim 18, Lee discloses the system of claim 17 wherein the virtual workflow includes a routing task for interacting with a collaborating virtual workflow (col. 1:45-55 "... workflow program route ...").

Per claim 19, Lee discloses the system of claim 18 wherein the aggregation engine is operable to insert a plurality of aggregation routing task pairs into the aggregated workflow (col. 10:1-10 "... add a work list ..."), each of the aggregation routing task pairs encompassing a virtual task and an associated actual task (e.g. FIG. 9, element 502a-502d and related text),

where the aggregation routing task pairs are in series with one another and with the routing task
(e.g. FIG. 3, element 408 and related text).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US
6,920,456 B1) in view of Du (US 6,052,684).

Per claim 8, Lee does not explicitly disclose the workflow model of claim 1 wherein the
execution includes concurrent execution of the workflow and the workflow view. However, Du
discloses a system for allowing consistent execution of a workflow process in a computer-
enabled workflow management system. The workflow process includes at least one sequence of
workflow actions, having at least one set of parallel workflow action and being configured as a
number of nodes interconnected by arc (*Fig. 2)*. Therefore it would have been obvious to one
skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to design a system that allow for
concurrent execution of conflicting workflow activities and yet does not abort the completed
activities as once suggested by Du (col. 10:62-68).

Per claim 20, this is the system version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 1),
wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth
above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac T. Tecklu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:300A - 8:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Isaac Tecklu
Art Unit 2192